arXiv:math/9910161v1 [math.LO] 28 Oct 1999

ALMOST FREE SPLITTERS

Rüdiger Göbel and Saharon Shelah

Abstract

Let R be a subring of the rationals. We want to investigate self splitting R-modules G that is $\operatorname{Ext}_R(G,G)=0$ holds. For simplicity we will call such modules splitters, see [16]. Also other names like stones are used, see a dictionary in Ringel's paper [14]. Our investigation continues [10]. In [10] we answered an open problem by constructing a large class of splitters. Classical splitters are free modules and torsion-free, algebraically compact ones. In [10] we concentrated on splitters which are larger then the continuum and such that countable submodules are not necessarily free. The 'opposite' case of $\aleph_1$-free splitters of cardinality less or equal to $\aleph_1$ was singled out because of basically different techniques. This is the target of the present paper. If the splitter is countable, then it must be free over some subring of the rationals by Hausen [12]. Contrary to the results in [10] and in accordance to [12] we can show that all $\aleph_1$-free splitters of cardinality $\aleph_1$ are free indeed.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper R will denote a subring of the rationals $\mathbb{Q}$ and we will consider R-modules in order to find out when they are splitters. 'Splitters' were introduced in Schultz [16]. They also come up under different names as mentioned in the abstract.

Definition 1.1 *An R-module G is a splitter if and only if* $\operatorname{Ext}_R(G,G)=0$ *or equivalently if* $\operatorname{Ext}_{\mathbb{Z}}(G,G)=0$ *which is the case if and only if any R-module sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow G \xrightarrow{\beta} X \xrightarrow{\alpha} G \to 0$$

This work is supported by the project No. G-0294-081.06/93 of the German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research & Development
AMS subject classification:
primary 13C05, 18E40, 18G05, 20K20, 20K35, 20K40
secondary: 13D30, 18G25, 20K25, 20K30, 13C10
Key words and phrases: self-splitting modules, criteria for freeness of modules
GbSh 682 in Shelah's list of publications

splits.

A short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \xrightarrow{\alpha} A \to 0$$

represents 0 in $\operatorname{Ext}(A,B)$ if and only if there is a splitting map $\gamma : A \longrightarrow C$ such that $\gamma\alpha = id_A$. Here maps are acting on the right.

Recall an easy basic observation, see [5]:

If $\operatorname{Ext}(A,B) = 0, A' \subseteq A$ *and* $B' \subseteq B$*, then* $\operatorname{Ext}(A', B/B') = 0$ *as well.*

The first result showing freeness of splitters is much older then the notion of splitters and is due to Hausen [12]. It says that any countable, torsion-free abelian group is a splitter if and only if it is free over its nucleus. The nucleus is the largest subring R of $\mathbb{Q}$ which makes the abelian group canonically into an R-module. More precisely

Definition 1.2 *The nucleus R of a torsion-free abelian group $G \neq 0$ is the subring R of $\mathbb{Q}$ generated by all $\frac{1}{p}$ (p any prime) for which G is p-divisible, i.e. $pG = G$.*

The fixed ring R mentioned at the beginning will be the nucleus $R = \operatorname{nuc} G$ of the associated abelian group G.

The following result reduces the study of splitters among abelian groups to those which are torsion-free and reduced modules over their nuclei.

Theorem 1.3 ([16]) *Let G be any abelian group and $G = D \oplus C$ a decomposition of G into the maximal divisible subgroup D and a reduced complement C. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

(i) G is a splitter.

$$(ii) \begin{cases} (a) & D \text{ is torsion (possibly 0), } C \text{ is a torsion-free (reduced) splitter with} \\ & pC = C \text{ for all } p-\text{primary components } D_p \neq 0 \text{ of } D. \\ (b) & D \text{ is not torsion and } C \text{ is cotorsion.} \end{cases}$$

Many splitters are constructed in [10], in fact we are also able to prescribe their endomorphism rings. This shows that uncountable splitters are not classifiable in any reasonable way, a result very much in contrast to classical well-known (uncountable) splitters which are the torsion-free algebraically compact (or cotorsion) groups.

The classical splitters come up naturally among many others when considering Salce's work [15] on cotorsion theories: A cotorsion theory is a pair of classes of R-modules $(\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{C})$ which are maximal, closed under extensions such that the torsion-free class $\mathfrak{F}$ is closed under subgroups and the cotorsion class $\mathfrak{C}$ is closed under epimorphic images and $\operatorname{Ext}(F, C) = 0$ for all $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $C \in \mathfrak{C}$. The elements in $\mathfrak{F} \cap \mathfrak{C}$ are splitters and in case of Harrison's classical cotorsion theory these are the torsion-free, algebraically compact groups. For the trivial cotorsion theory these are free R-modules.

Hausen's [12] theorem mentioned above can be slightly extended without much effort, see [10].

Theorem 1.4 *If* $R = \operatorname{nuc} G$ *is the nucleus of the torsion-free group* G *and* G *is a splitter of cardinality* $< 2^{\aleph_0}$*, then* G *is an* $\aleph_1$*-free* R*-module.*

Recall that G is an $\aleph_1$-free R-module if any countably generated R-submodule is free. The algebraic key tool of this paper can be found in Section 2. We consider torsion-free R-modules M of finite rank which are minimal in rank and non-free. They are (by definition) n-free-by-1 R-modules if $\operatorname{rk} M = n + 1$; the name is self explaining: They are pure extensions of a free R-module of rank n by an R-module of rank 1. Similar to simply presented groups, n-free-by-1 groups are easy represented by free generators and relations. Using these minimal R-modules we will show the following

Main Theorem 1.5 *Any* $\aleph_1$*-free splitter of cardinality* $\aleph_1$ *is free over its nucleus.*

The proof will depend on the existence of particular chains of $\aleph_1$-free R-module of cardinality $\aleph_1$ which we use to divide $\aleph_1$-free R-modules of cardinality $\aleph_1$ into three types (I,II,III). This may be interesting independently and we would like to draw attention to Section 3. In Sections 4-7 we use our knowledge about these chains to show freeness of splitter. The proof is divided into two main cases depending on the continuum hypothesis CH (Section 5) and its negation (Section 4). In the appendix Section 8 we present a proof of the main result of Section 5 under the weaker set theoretic assumption WCH $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$, a weak form of CH which will be interesting (only) for splitters of cardinality $> \aleph_1$. The results in Section 6 and 7 on splitters of type II and III do not use the case distinction by additional axioms of set theory.

2 Solving Linear Equations

Let R be a subring of $\mathbb{Q}$. Then R-modules of minimal finite rank which are not free will lead to particular infinite systems of linear equations. Consider the Baer-Specker R-module R^ω of all R-valued functions $f : \omega \to R$ on ω, also denoted by $f = (f_m)_{m \in \omega}$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $p = (p_m)_{m\in\omega},\ k_i = (k_{im})_{m\in\omega} \in R^\omega \quad (i < n)$ where each p_m is not a unit of R. Then we can find a sequence $s = (s_m)_{m\in\omega} \in R^\omega$ such that the following system of equations $(\hat{s})$ has no solution $\bar{x} = \ (x_0, \dots, x_n) \in R^{n+1},\ y_m \in R$ with*

$$y_0 = x_n,\ y_{m+1}p_m = y_m + \sum_{i<n} x_i\, k_{im} + s_m \quad (m \in \omega). \qquad (\hat{s})$$

Proof: We will use Cantor's argument which shows that there are more real numbers than rationals. First we enumerate all elements in R^{n+1} as

$$W = W = \{\overline{x}^m = (x_0^m, \dots, x_n^m) \ :\ m \in \omega\}$$

and construct $s \in R^\omega$ inductively.

It is interesting to note that the set of bad elements

$$B = \{s \in R^\omega : \exists \bar{x} \in R^{n+1},\ (y_m)_{m\in\omega} \in R^\omega \text{ solving } \ (\hat{s})\} \subseteq R^\omega$$

is a submodule of R^ω but $|B|$ is uncountable in many cases. Hence enumerating B would not help.

Suppose $s_0, \dots, s_{m-1} \in R$ are chosen and we must find s_m. We calculate $y_0, \dots, y_m$ from $s_0, \dots, s_{m-1}$ and $y_0 = x_n^m, x_1^m, \dots, x_{n-1}^m$ and equation $(\hat{s})$ up to $m-1$. The values are uniquely defined by torsion-freeness and in particular

$$z = y_m + \sum_{i<n} x_i^m\, k_{im} \in R \tag{2.1}$$

is uniquely defined. Recall that p_m is not a unit and either p_m does not divide z, then we set $s_m = 0$ or we can choose some $s_m \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and p_m does not divide $z + s_m$. In any case

$$y\, p_m = z + s_m \text{ has no solution in } R \tag{2.2}$$

and s_m is defined.

Suppose that $(\hat{s})$ has a solution $\bar{x} \in R^{n+1}$, then $\bar{x} = \overline{x}^m$ for some m by our enumeration. We calculate y_{m+1} from $(\hat{s})$ substituting $\bar{x}$, hence

$$y_{m+1}\, p_m = y_m + \sum_{i<m} x_i^m\, k_{im} + s_m = z + s_m$$

is solvable by (2.1), which contradicts (2.2). $\square$

If $G' \subseteq G$ is a pure R-submodule of some R-module G which is of finite rank, not a free R-module such that all pure R-submodules of G' of smaller rank are free, then we will say that G' is **minimal non-free**. Such minimal non-free modules are "simply presented" in the sense that there are $x_i, y_m \in G'$ $(i < n, m \in \omega)$ such that

$$G' = \langle B, y_m R : m \in \omega \rangle \text{ with } B = \bigoplus_{i<n} x_i R \tag{2.3}$$

and the **only relations**

$$y_{m+1} p_m = y_m + \sum_{i<n} x_i \, k_{im} \qquad (m \in \omega) \tag{2.4}$$

and coefficients $p_m,\ k_{im} \in R$. The submodule B is pure in G'. If G is not $\aleph_1$-free, then the existence of minimal non-free submodules is immediate by Pontryagin's theorem. Non-freeness of G' implies that the Baer type of

$$G'/B = T \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$$

is strictly greater than the type of R, see Fuchs [5, Vol 2, pp 107-112].

In more details we have that B is a pure submodule of G', hence G'/B is torsion-free of rank 1 and since G' is not a free R-module, $G'/B = T$ cannot be isomorphic to R. If $\varphi : G' \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is the canonical homomorphism taking B to 0 and y_0 to $1 \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $\operatorname{Im} \varphi \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ represents the type of $\langle y_0 + B \rangle_* = G'/B$. There are $p_m \in \mathbb{N}$, not units in R such that $T = \bigcup_{m \in \omega} q_m^{-1}\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ and $q_m = \prod_{i<m} p_i$. In order to derive the crucial equations as in the above definition we choose preimages $y_m \in G'$ of q_m^{-1} such that

$$y_0 \varphi = q_0 = 1 \text{ and } y_m \varphi = q_m^{-1} \qquad (m \in \omega).$$

Using $q_{m+1} = q_m p_m$ we find elements $k_{im} \in R$ $(i < n)$, $g_m \in G'$ such that (2.3) and (2.4) holds. We will constantly use the representations (2.3) and (2.4) which are basic for the following

Proposition 2.2 *Let $G_\alpha \subseteq G_{\alpha+1}$ be a countable free resolution of G' as in (2.3) and let the relations (2.4) be expressed in $G_{\alpha+1}$ by*

$$y''_{m+1} p_m = y''_m + \sum_{i<n} x''_i \, k_{im} + g_m$$

for some $g_m \in G_\alpha$; let z_m $(m \in \omega)$ be non-trivial elements of an $\aleph_1$-free R-module H^0 of cardinality $\aleph_1$ and

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H_\alpha \xrightarrow{h} G_\alpha \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence. Then we can find an R-module

$$H' = \langle H_\alpha \oplus B', y'_m : m \in \omega \rangle$$

with $B' = \bigoplus_{i<n} x'_i R$, $\overline{g}_m h = g_m$ *and the only relations in* H'

$$y'_{m+1} p_m = y'_m + \sum_{i<n} x'_i k_{im} + z_m + \overline{g}_m. \qquad (m \in \omega)$$

The map h *extends to* h' *by* $x'_i h' = x''_i$, $y'_m h' = y''_m$ *such that the new diagram with vertical maps inclusions commutes:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & H^0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H_\alpha \arrow[r, "h"] \arrow[d] & G_\alpha \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & H^0 \arrow[r] & H' \arrow[r, "h'"] & G_{\alpha+1} \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof: Let

$$F_{\alpha+1} = H_\alpha \oplus \bigoplus_{i<n} \bar{x}_i R \oplus \bigoplus_{m\in\omega} \bar{y}_m R$$

and define

$$N_{\alpha+1} = \langle (\bar{y}_{m+1} p_m - \bar{y}_m - \sum_{i<n} \bar{x}_i k_{im} - z_m - \bar{g}_m) R : m \in \omega \rangle.$$

Hence $H' = F_{\alpha+1}/N_{\alpha+1}$ and let

$$x'_i = \bar{x}_i + N_{\alpha+1},\ y'_m = \bar{y}_m + N_{\alpha+1} \text{ and } x' = \bar{x} + N_{\alpha+1}.$$

First we see that

$$(a) \begin{cases} x \longrightarrow x' \ (x \in H_\alpha) \text{ defines an embedding } H_\alpha \longrightarrow H' \\ \text{and then we identify } H_\alpha \text{ with its image in } H'. \end{cases}$$

It remains to show that $H_\alpha \cap N_{\alpha+1} = 0$ viewed in $F_{\alpha+1}$. If $x \in H_\alpha \cap N_{\alpha+1}$, then there are $k_m \in R$ for $m \leq l$ and some $l \in \omega$ such that

$$\sum_{m=0}^{l} (\bar{y}_{m+1} p_m - \bar{y}_m - \sum_{i<n} \bar{x}_i k_{im} - z_m - \bar{g}_m) k_m = x \in H_\alpha.$$

We get $x = -\sum_{m=0}^{l}(z_m + \bar{g}_m)k_m$ and $\sum_{m=0}^{l}(\bar{y}_{m+1}p_m - \bar{y}_m - \sum_{i<n}\bar{x}_i k_{im})k_m = 0$. The coefficient of $\bar{y}_{l+1}$ is $p_l k_l = 0$, hence $k_l = 0$ and going down we get $k_m = 0$ for all $m \le l$, hence $x = 0$ and (a) holds. Due to $N_{\alpha+1}$ we have the useful system of equations in H'.

(b) $\quad y'_{m+1}p_m = y'_m + \sum_{i<n} x'_i k_{im} + z_m + \bar{g}_m$ with $\bar{g}_m \in H_\alpha$.

In view of (a) we also have

(c) $\quad H' = \langle H_\alpha \oplus B', y'_m : m \in \omega\rangle$ with $B' = \bigoplus_{i<n} x'_i R \subseteq H'$.

Next we claim that

$$(d)\ \begin{cases} \text{If } h' \restriction H_\alpha = h, x'_i h' = x_i \text{ and } y'_m h' = y_m \ (i < n, m \in \omega), \text{ then} \\ h' : H' \longrightarrow G_{\alpha+1} \text{ is a well-defined homomorphism with} \end{cases}$$

(e) $\ker h' = H^0$ and $\operatorname{Im} h' = G_{\alpha+1}$.

As h' is defined on non-free generators, we must check that the relations between them are preserved, when passing to the proposed image. The relations are given by $N_{\alpha+1}$ or equivalently by (b). Using the definition (d) we see that the relations (b) are mapped summand-wise under h' as follows.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
y'_{m+1}p_m \arrow[d] & + & y'_m \arrow[d] & + & \sum_{i<n} x'_i k_{im} \arrow[d] & + & z_m \arrow[d] & + & \bar{g}_m \arrow[d] \\
y_{m+1}p_m & ? & y_m & + & \sum_{i<n} x_i k_{im} & + & 0 & + & g_m
\end{tikzcd}$$

and inspection of (2.4) and the relations in $G_{\alpha+1}$ shows that ? is an equality sign "=". Hence h' is well-defined. Notice that $H_\alpha h' = H_\alpha h = G_\alpha$, therefore h' induces a homomorphism

$$H'/H_\alpha \longrightarrow G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$$

and the last argument and $g_m \in G_\alpha$ show that this is an isomorphism. Hence passing from h to the extended map h' the kernel cannot grow, we have $H^0 = \ker h' = \ker h$ and $\operatorname{Im} h' = G_{\alpha+1}$ is obvious, so (d) and (e) and the proposition are shown.

3 The Main Reduction Lemma - Types I, II and III

The Chase radical νG of a torsion-free R-module G is the characteristic submodule

$$\nu G = \bigcap\{U \subseteq G,\ G/U \text{ is } \aleph_1\text{-free }\}.$$

Since $G/\nu G$ is also $\aleph_1$-free, the Chase radical is the smallest submodule with $\aleph_1$-free quotient. If U is a submodule of G we write

$\nu_U G = G'$ for the Chase radical of G over U which is defined by $\nu(G/U) = G'/U$.

Given any $\aleph_1$-free R-module G of cardinality $|G| = \aleph_1$, we fix an $\aleph_1$-filtration

$$G = \bigcup_{\alpha<\omega_1} G^0_\alpha$$

which is an ascending, continuous chain of countable, free and pure R-submodule G^0_α of G with $G^0_0 = 0$.

We want to find a new ascending, continuous chain of pure R-submodules G_α (not necessarily countable) such that $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\omega_1} G_\alpha$. However we do require that

$$G/G_\alpha \text{ is } \aleph_1\text{-free if } \alpha \text{ is not a limit ordinal.} \tag{3.1}$$

We will use the new chain to divide $\aleph_1$-free R-module of cardinality $\aleph_1$ into three types. This distinction helps to show that $\aleph_1$-free splitters of cardinality $\aleph_1$ are free.

Suppose $G_\beta \subseteq G$ is constructed for all $\beta < \alpha$. Next we want to define G_α. If α is a limit ordinal, then

$$G_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} G_\beta.$$

Hence we may assume that $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and we must define $G_\alpha = G_{\beta+1}$. In order to ensure $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1} G_\alpha$ we let

$$G_{\alpha 0} = (G_\beta + G^0_\alpha)_* \subseteq G \tag{3.2}$$

the pure R-submodule generated by $G_\beta + G^0_\alpha$. In any case we want to ensure that (3.1) holds, hence $\nu_{G_{\alpha 0}} G \subseteq G_\alpha$. Therefore we construct an ascending, continuous chain of pure R-submodules

$$\{G_{\alpha j} : j < \omega_1\} \text{ with } G_{\alpha j+1}/G_{\alpha j} = 0 \text{ or minimal non-free for each } 0 < j < \omega_1 \tag{3.3}$$

such that $G_\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{j\in\omega_1} G_{\alpha j}$. Suppose that $G_{\alpha i}$ is defined for all $i < j < \omega_1$. If j is a limit ordinal we take $G_{\alpha j} = \bigcup\limits_{i<j} G_{\alpha i}$ and if $j = i + 1$ we distinguish two cases:

$$\text{If } G/G_{\alpha i} \text{ is } \aleph_1\text{-free, then } G_{\alpha j} = G_{\alpha i} \text{ hence } G_\alpha = G_{\alpha i} \text{ and } |G_\alpha/G_{\alpha-1}| = \aleph_0. \tag{3.4}$$

Otherwise $G/G_{\alpha i}$ is not $\aleph_1$-free, and by Pontryagin's theorem we can find a finite rank minimal non-free pure R-submodule $M/G_{\alpha i}$ of $G/G_{\alpha i}$. Since $G = \bigcup_{i \in \omega_1} G_i^0$ and $\emptyset \neq M \setminus G_{\alpha i} \leq G$, there is also a least ordinal $\gamma = \gamma(M) = \gamma(M/G_{\alpha i}) < \omega_1$, such that

$$(M \setminus G_{\alpha i}) \cap (G^0_{\gamma+1} \setminus G^0_\gamma) \neq \emptyset. \tag{3.5}$$

Among the candidates M we choose one with the smallest $\gamma(M)$ and take it for $M = G_{\alpha i+1}$. This completes the construction of the $G_{\alpha i}$ $'s$. Notice that either the construction of G_α stops as in case (3.4) or we arrive at the second possibility:

$$G_{\alpha i+1}/G_{\alpha i} \text{ is minimal non-free for each } i < \omega_1 \text{ and } |G_\alpha/G_{\alpha-1}| = \aleph_1. \tag{3.6}$$

It remains to show that in case (3.6) the following holds.

$$\nu_{G_{\alpha 0}} G = G_\alpha \text{ or equivalently } G/G_\alpha \text{ is } \aleph_1\text{-free.} \tag{3.7}$$

Suppose that G/G_α is not $\aleph_1$-free and let X be a non-free submodule of minimal finite rank in G/G_α which exists by Pontryagin's theorem. Representing X in G we have

$$G'' = \langle x_i, y_m, G_\alpha : i < n, m \in \omega \rangle_* \text{ with } G''/G_\alpha = X,$$

see also Göbel, Shelah [10]. There are elements $g_m \in G_\alpha$ $(m \in \omega)$ such that

$$y_{m+1} p_m = y_m + \sum_{i<n} x_i k_{im} + g_m$$

for some $p_m, k_{im} \in R$ (p_m not units of R). We take

$$G' = \langle x_i, y_m, g_m : i < n, m \in \omega \rangle_* \subseteq G,$$

hence $X = G' + G_\alpha/G_\alpha$ was our starting point. Since G' is obviously countable, there is a $\gamma^* \in \omega_1$ with $G' \subseteq G^0_{\gamma^*}$. If $\{G_{\alpha j} : j < \omega_1\}$ is the chain constructed above, we also find $i \in \omega_1$ with $g_m \in G_{\alpha i}$ for all $m \in \omega$. If $i \leq j \in \omega_1$, then $G' + G_{\alpha j}/G_{\alpha j}$ is an epimorphic image of X, hence minimal non-free or 0. The second case leads to the immediate contradiction:

$$G' \subseteq G_{\alpha j} \subseteq G_\alpha \text{ but } X \neq 0.$$

Hence $G' + G_{\alpha j}/G_{\alpha j} \neq 0$ was a candidate for constructing $G_{\alpha j+1}$ for any $i \leq j \in \omega_1$. Has it been used? We must compare the γ-invariant $\gamma(G' + G_{\alpha j}/G_{\alpha j})$ with the various $\gamma(G_{\alpha j+1}/G_{\alpha j})$. From $G' \subseteq G^0_{\gamma^*}$ we see that there is $\gamma^j < \gamma^*$ such that

$$(G' + G_{\alpha j} \setminus G_{\alpha j}) \cap (G^0_{\gamma^j+1} \setminus G^0_{\gamma^j} \neq \emptyset.$$

By minimality of $\gamma_j =: \gamma(G_{\alpha j+1}/G_{\alpha j})$ we must have $\gamma_j \leq \gamma^j < \gamma^*$ and

$$(G_{\alpha j+1} \setminus G_{\alpha j}) \cap (G^0_{\gamma_j+1} \setminus G^0_{\gamma_j}) \neq \emptyset$$

and $(G_{\alpha j} \cap G^0_{\gamma^*}) \quad (j \in \omega_1)$ is a **strictly** increasing chain of length ω_1 of the countable module $G^0_{\gamma^*}$, which is impossible. Hence G/G_α is $\aleph_1$-free and (3.7) is shown. We have a useful additional property of the constructed chain which reflects (3.7).

Corollary 3.1 *If $0 \neq \alpha \in \omega_1$ is not a limit ordinal, then $G_\alpha = \nu_{G^0_\alpha} G$.*

Proof: We concentrate on the case (3.6) and only note that the case (3.4) is similar.

Recall from (3.7), that G/G_α is $\aleph_1$-free, hence the claim of the corollary is equivalent to say that any submodule X of G_α must be G_α if only $G^0_\alpha \subseteq X$ with G_α/X $\aleph_1$-free.

Let $\alpha > 0$ and suppose $G^0_\alpha \subseteq X \subseteq G_\alpha$ and $0 \neq G_\alpha/X$ is $\aleph_1$-free. First we claim that

$$G_\beta \subseteq X \text{ for all } \beta < \alpha.$$

If this is not the case, then let $\beta < \alpha$ be minimal with $G_\beta \not\subseteq X$. Recall that β can not be a limit ordinal and we can write $\beta = \gamma + 1$ for some $\gamma < \beta$. We have $G_\beta = \bigcup_{j \in \omega_1} G_{\beta j}$, hence

$$i_\beta = \min \{j \in \omega_1 : G_{\beta j} \not\subseteq X\} \in \omega_1$$

exists. If $i_\beta = 0$, then $G^0_\beta \subseteq G^0_\alpha \subseteq X$ from $\alpha > \beta$ and $G_{\beta 0} \not\subseteq X$. We get $G_{\beta 0} = \langle G_\gamma, G^0_\beta \rangle_* \not\subseteq X$ and $G^0_\beta \subseteq X$ requires $G_\gamma \not\subseteq X$, contradicting minimality of β. Hence $i_\beta > 0$ and $i_\beta = j + 1$. We have $G_{\beta i_\beta} \not\subseteq X$ and $G_{\beta j} \subseteq X$ from $j < i_\beta$ and minimality of i_β. However $G_{\beta j+1}/G_{\beta j}$ is minimal non-free, and $0 \neq G_{\beta j+1} + X/X \subseteq G/X$ is an epimorphic image, hence non-free as well. Therefore G/X is not $\aleph_1$-free, a contradiction showing our first claim.

From the first claim we derive $\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} G_\beta \subseteq X$. Now there must be a minimal

$$i_\alpha = \min \{j : G_{\alpha j} \not\subseteq X\} \in \omega_1,$$

which cannot be a limit ordinal, and again $i_\alpha > 0$, hence $i_\alpha = j + 1$. We find $G_{\alpha j} \subseteq X, G_{\alpha j+1} \not\subseteq X$ and G_α/X cannot be $\aleph_1$-free, a final contradiction. $\square$

We now distinguish cases for G depending on the existence of particular filtrations. Let $G = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} G_\alpha$ be the filtration constructed from the $\aleph_1$-filtration $G = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} G^0_\alpha$.

If there is an ordinal $\beta < \omega_1$ (which we assume to be minimal) such that $G = G_\beta$, then let $C = G^0_\beta$ which is a countable, free and pure R-submodule of G. From Corollary 3.1 we see that $\nu_C G = G$. Hence, beginning with C we get a new $\aleph_1$-filtration (we use the same notation) $\{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ of countable, pure and free R-submodules of G such that $G_0 = C$ and **each** $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ ($\alpha > 0$) is minimal non-free. In this case we say that G and the filtration are of type I.

In the opposite case the chain only terminates at the limit ordinal ω_1 i.e. $G_\beta \neq G$ for all $\beta < \omega_1$. We have a proper filtration $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\omega_1} G_\alpha$ such that Corollary 3.1 holds. If for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$ for some $i < \omega_1$ case (3.4) occurs, then the constructed chain $\{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ is an $\aleph_1$-filtration of countable, pure and free R-submodules with the properties of Corollary 3.1 and (3.1). We say that the chain and G are of type II respectively.

If G is not of type I or of type II we say that G is of type III. In this case, there is a first $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ is uncountable. We may assume that $\alpha = 0$. With the new enumeration we see that the following holds for type III:

$$(III) \quad \begin{cases} G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\omega_1} G_\alpha,\ G_0 = 0, |G_1| = \aleph_1 \text{ and (3.1) holds,} \\ G_1 = \bigcup\limits_{j\in\omega_1} G_{0j} \text{ is an } \aleph_1\text{-filtration of pure submodules of } G_1 \\ \text{ with } \textbf{each } G_{0j+1}/G_{0j} \text{ minimal non-free.} \end{cases}$$

We have a

Reduction-Lemma 3.2 *Any $\aleph_1$-free module G of cardinality $\aleph_1$ is either of type I, II or III.*

4 Splitters Of Cardinality $\aleph_1 < 2^{\aleph_0}$ Are Free

In this section we do not need the classification of $\aleph_1$-free R-modules of cardinality $\aleph_1$ given in Lemma 3.2. Moreover, we note that $\aleph_1$-freeness of splitter of cardinality $\aleph_1 < 2^{\aleph_0}$ follows by Theorem 1.4. In fact we will present a uniform proof showing freeness of splitters up to cardinality $\aleph_1 < 2^{\aleph_0}$ which extends Hausen's result [12] concerning countable splitters. We begin with a trivial observation

Proposition 4.1 *Let $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1} G_\alpha$ be an $\aleph_1$-filtration of pure and free R-submodules G_α of G. Then* $\operatorname{nuc}(G_\alpha) = R$ *for all $\alpha \in \omega_1$.*

Proof: Choose any basic element $b \in G_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \omega_1$. If $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ divides b in G, then r divides b in G_α by purity, hence $r \in R$ from $bR \oplus C = G_\alpha$ and $\operatorname{nuc} G = R$.

Corollary 4.2 ($\aleph_1 < 2^{\aleph_0}$). *If G is a splitter of cardinality $\leq \aleph_1$ and $\operatorname{nuc} G = R$, then there is an $\aleph_1$-filtration $G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$ of pure and free R-submodules G_α such that $\operatorname{nuc} G_\alpha = R$ for all $\alpha \in \omega_1$.*

Proof: From $\aleph_1 < 2^{\aleph_0}$ and Göbel and Shelah [10], see Theorem 1.4, follows that G is an $\aleph_1$-free R-module and G has an $\aleph_1$-filtration as in the hypothesis of Proposition 4.1. Hence Corollary 4.2 follows by the Proposition 4.1. $\square$

Definition 4.3 *Let G be a torsion-free abelian group with $\operatorname{nuc} G = R$ and X an R-submodule of G. Then X is contra-Whitehead in G if the following holds.*
There are $z_m \in G,\ p_m,\ k_{im} \in R$ $(i < n,\ m \in \omega)$ such that the system of equations

$$Y_{m+1}p_m \equiv Y_m + \sum_{i<n} X_i k_{im} + z_m \ mod \ \ X \qquad (m \in \omega)$$

has no solutions $y_m, a_i \in G$ (for Y_m, X_i respectively) with $\bigoplus_{i<n}(a_i + X)R$ free of rank n and pure in G/X. Otherwise we call X pro-Whitehead in G.

For $X \subseteq G$ as in the definition let $\mathfrak{W}$ be the set of all finite sequences $\bar{a} = (a_0, a_1 \dots, a_n)$ such that
(i) $a_i \in G$ $(i \leq n)$
(ii) $\bigoplus_{i<n}(a_i + X)\ R$ is pure in G/X.
(iii) $\langle (a_i + X)R : i \leq n\rangle_*$ is not a free R-module in G/X.
In particular $G'_{\bar{a}} = \bigoplus_{i<n} a_i R\ \oplus X$ is a pure submodule of $G_{\bar{a}} = \langle X,\ a_i R : i \leq n\rangle_*$ and of G, the module $G_{\bar{a}}/X$ is an n-free-by-1 R-module. From (2.4) we find $p_{\bar{a}m} \in \mathbb{N}$ not units in R and elements $k_{\bar{a}im} \in R$ $(i < n)$, $g_{\bar{a}m} \in G_{\bar{a}}$ such that

$$y_{\bar{a}m+1}p_{\bar{a}m} = y_{\bar{a}m} + \sum_{i<n} a_i k_{\bar{a}im} + g_{\bar{a}m} \qquad (m \in \omega) \tag{4.1}$$

The equations (4.1) are the basic systems of equations which decide about G to be a splitter. We will also consider an 'inhomogeneous counter part' of (4.1) and choose a sequence $\bar{z} = (z_m : m \in \omega)$ of elements $z_m \in G$. The $\bar{z}$-inhomogeneous counter part of (4.1) is the system of equations

$$Y_{m+1}p_{\bar{a}m} \equiv Y_m + \sum_{i<n} X_i k_{\bar{a}im} + z_m \ mod \ \ X \qquad (m \in \omega) \tag{4.2}$$

According to the above definition we also say that $\bar{a} \in \mathfrak{W}$ is contra-Whitehead if (4.2) has no solutions y_m $(m \in \omega)$ in G (hence in $G_{\bar{a}}$) for some $\bar{z}$ and $X_i = a_i$. Otherwise we say that $\bar{a}$ is pro-Whitehead. If $G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$ is an $\aleph_1$-filtration of G, then we define $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$ for $X = G_\alpha$ and let $S = \{\alpha \in \omega_1\colon$ there exists $\bar{a} \in \mathfrak{W}_\alpha$ contra-Whitehead $\}$.

Proposition 4.4 *If $G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$ and S as above is stationary in ω_1, then G is not a splitter.*

Before proving this proposition we simplify our notation. If $\alpha \in S$ we choose

$$z^\alpha_m \in G,\ \bar{a} = (a^\alpha_0, a^\alpha_1, \dots, a^\alpha_n),\ p_{\bar{a}m} = p_{\alpha m},\ g_{\bar{a}m} = g^\alpha_m,\ k_{\bar{a}im} = k_{\alpha im},\ y_{\bar{a}m} = y^\alpha_m$$

so that equations (4.1) and (4.2) become for $X = G_\alpha$

$$y^\alpha_{m+1} p_{\alpha m} = y^\alpha_m + \sum_{i<n} a^\alpha_i k_{\alpha im} + g^\alpha_m \quad (m \in \omega) \tag{4.3}$$

with $\bar{z}^\alpha$-inhomogeneous counter part

$$Y_{m+1} p_{\alpha m} \equiv Y_m + \sum_{i<n} X_i k_{\alpha im} + z^\alpha_m \ mod\ \ G_\alpha \qquad (m \in \omega). \tag{4.4}$$

Hence (4.3) is a system of equations with solutions $y^\alpha_m,\ a^\alpha_i,\ g^\alpha_m$ in $G_{\alpha+1}$, while (4.4) with variables $Y_m,\ X_i$ $(m \in \omega,\ i < n)$ has no solutions in G, as discussed in Definition 4.3 for $X = G_\alpha$. The set of limit ordinals is a cub, hence we may restrict S to this cub and assume that S consists of limit ordinals only. If $\alpha \in S$ we also may assume that

$$G_{\alpha+1} = \langle G_\alpha,\ a^\alpha_i R : i < n\rangle_* = \langle G_\alpha,\ a^\alpha_i R,\ y^\alpha_m R : m \in \omega_1,\ \ i < n\rangle.$$

We begin the
Proof of the Proposition 4.4:
We will use the last remarks for constructing $h : H \longrightarrow G$ such that

$$(*) \qquad 0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H \xrightarrow{h} G \longrightarrow 0$$

does not split, hence $\mathrm{Ext}\,(G, H^0) \neq 0$. We will have $H^0 \cong G$, hence $\mathrm{Ext}\,(G,G) \neq 0$ and G is not a splitter.
Choose an isomorphism $\gamma : G \longrightarrow H^0$ which carries the $\aleph_1$-filtration $\{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ to $H^0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} H'_\alpha$ and z^α_m to ${z'}_{\alpha m}$. Inductively we want to define short exact sequences

$$(\beta) \qquad 0 \longrightarrow H^0 \xrightarrow{id} H_\beta \xrightarrow{h_\beta} G_\beta \longrightarrow 0 \qquad (\beta < \alpha)$$

which are increasing continuously. Let

$$(0) \qquad 0 \longrightarrow H^0 \xrightarrow{id} H_0 \xrightarrow{h_0} 0 \longrightarrow 0$$

be defined for $H_0 = H^0$ with h_0 the zero-map and suppose (β) is defined for all $\beta < \alpha < \omega_1$ with α a limit ordinal. We take unions and (α) is defined. If $\alpha \in \omega_1 \setminus S$, we extend (α) trivially to get $(\alpha+1)$ and if $\alpha \in S$ we must work for $(\alpha+1)$:
We apply Proposition 2.2 to find $H_\alpha \subseteq H_{\alpha+1}$ with

$$H_{\alpha+1} = \langle H_\alpha, e_{\alpha m},\ x_{\alpha m}\ :\ m \in \omega,\ \ i < n\rangle.$$

and relations

$$e_{\alpha m+1}\, p_{\alpha m} = e_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} x_{\alpha i} k_{\alpha i m} + y_{\alpha m} + z'_{\alpha m} \quad (m \in \omega) \tag{4.5}$$

with $y_{\alpha m} h_\alpha = g_m^\alpha \in G_\alpha$. We want to extend the homomorphism $h_\alpha : H_\alpha \longrightarrow G_\alpha$ to $h_{\alpha+1} : H_{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow G_{\alpha+1}$, and set $e_{\alpha m} h_{\alpha+1} = y_m^\alpha$ and $x_{\alpha i} h_{\alpha+1} = a_i^\alpha$. By Proposition 2.2 the map $h_{\alpha+1}$ is a well defined homomorphism. It is clearly surjective with kernel H^0. Hence $(\alpha+1)$ is well-defined for all $\alpha \in \omega_1$ and $h = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in \omega_1} h_\alpha$ shows $(*)$.
Finally we must show that $(*)$ does not split and suppose that $\sigma : G \longrightarrow H$ is a splitting map for $(*)$, hence $\sigma h = \mathrm{id}_G$ and $H = H^0 \oplus \mathrm{Im}\sigma$ and $g_m^\alpha = y_{\alpha m} h_\alpha = y_{\alpha m} h$, so $(y_{\alpha m} - g_m^\alpha \sigma)\, h = 0$ implies $y_{\alpha m} - g_m^\alpha \sigma \in H^0$ for all $\alpha \in S$. The set

$$C = \{\alpha \in \omega_1 : \alpha \text{ a limit ordinal } y_{\alpha m} - g_e^\alpha\, \sigma \in H'_\alpha\}$$

- by a back-and-forth argument - is a cub and hence $S \cap C$ is stationary in ω_1. We can find $\alpha \in C \cap S$ and consider the attached equations. In G holds (4.3)

$$y_{m+1}^\alpha\, p_{\alpha m} = y_m^\alpha + \sum_{i<n} a_i^\alpha k_{\alpha i m} + g_m^\alpha$$

and σ moves these equations to H:

$$(y_{m+1}^\alpha\, \sigma)\, p_{\alpha m} = (y_m^\alpha\, \sigma) + \sum_{i<n} (a_i^\alpha\, \sigma)\, k_{\alpha i m} + (g_m^\alpha\, \sigma)$$

which we subtract from (4.5). Hence

$$(e_{m+1}^\alpha - y_{m+1}^\alpha\, \sigma)\, p_{\alpha m} = (e_m^\alpha - y_m^\alpha\, \sigma) + \sum_{i<n} (x_{\alpha i} - a_i^\alpha\, \sigma)\, k_{\alpha i m} + (y_{\alpha m} - g_m^\alpha\, \sigma) + z'_{\alpha m}$$

Put

$$f_{\alpha m} = e^\alpha_m - g^\alpha_m \sigma,\ v_{\alpha i} = x_{\alpha i} - a^\alpha_i \sigma,\ w_{\alpha m} = y_{\alpha m} - g^\alpha_m\ \sigma$$

and note that

$$f_{\alpha m} h = e_{\alpha m} h - g^\alpha_m \sigma h = g^\alpha_m - g^\alpha_m = 0$$

hence $f_{\alpha m} \in \ker h = H^0$. Similarly $w_{\alpha m},\ v_{\alpha m} \in H^0$. The last equation turns into

$$f_{\alpha m+1}\ p_{\alpha m} = f_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n}\ v_{\alpha i m}\ k_{\alpha i m} + w_{\alpha m} + z'_{\alpha m} \quad (m \in \omega)$$

which, as just seen, is a system of equations in H^0. From $\alpha \in C$ we have $w_{\alpha m} \in H'_\alpha$. The isomorphism γ^{-1} moves the last equation back into G and $w_{\alpha m}\gamma^{-1} \in G_\alpha$. Using

$$f'_{\alpha m} = f_{\alpha m}\gamma^{-1},\ w'_{\alpha m} = w_{\alpha m}\gamma^{-1},\ v'_{\alpha i} = v_{\alpha i}\gamma^{-1}$$

we derive

$$f'_{\alpha m+1} p_{\alpha m} = f'_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} v'_{\alpha i} k_{\alpha i m} + w'_{\alpha m} + z^m_\alpha \quad (m \in \omega)$$

with $w'_{\alpha m} \in G_\alpha$ and z^m_α as in (4.4), which is impossible in the case $\alpha \in S$ which is contra-Whitehead, where we have chosen z^m_α accordingly. $\square$

Theorem 4.5 *Let G be a splitter of cardinality $< 2^{\aleph_0}$ with $\operatorname{nuc} G = R$. If X is a pure, countable R-submodule of G which is pro-Whitehead in G, then G/X is an $\aleph_1$-free R-module.*

Proof: First we assume that $\operatorname{nuc}(G/X) = R$ and suppose for contradiction that G/X is not an $\aleph_1$-free R-module. By Pontryagin's theorem we can find an R-submodule $Y \subseteq G/X$ of finite rank which is not free. We may assume that Y is of minimal rank. Hence

$$Y = \langle B, y_m R : m \in \omega \rangle, \quad B = \bigoplus_{i<n} \bar{x}_i R$$

with the only relations

$$y_{m+1} p_m = y_m + \sum_{i<n} \bar{x}_i k_{im} \quad (m \in \omega)$$

as in Section 2 such that each $p_m \in R$ is not a unit of R for $m \in \omega$. Choose $x_i \in G$ such that $x_i + X = \bar{x}_i$ for each $i < n$. We can also choose a sequence of elements

$z_m \in G$ such that $z_m + X$ is not divisible by p_{m-1} from $\operatorname{nuc}(G/X) = R$ $(m \in \omega)$.

If $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$, then let

$$\bar{z}^{\eta} = \langle \eta(e) z_e : e \in \omega \rangle = (z_e^{\eta}).$$

Recall that X is pro-Whitehead in G, hence the systems of equations

$$y_{m+1}^{\eta} p_m \equiv y_m^{\eta} + \sum_{i<n} x_i^k k_{im} + z_m^{\eta} \ mod \ \ X \qquad (m \in \omega) \qquad\qquad (\eta)$$

has solutions x_i^{η}, $y_m^{\eta} \in G$ for each $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$. Note that

$$|\{\langle x_i^{\eta} : i < n \rangle^{\wedge} \langle y_0^{\eta} \rangle : \eta \in {}^{\omega}2\}| \leq |G| < 2^{\aleph_0}.$$

We can find $\eta \neq \nu \in {}^{\omega}2$ such that $x_i^{\eta} = x_i^{\nu}$ for all $i < n$ and $y_0^{\eta} = y_0^{\nu}$. From $\eta \neq \nu$ we find a branching point $j \in \omega$ such that

$$\eta(j) \neq \nu(j) \text{ but } \eta \restriction j = \nu \restriction j.$$

We may assume

$$\eta(j) = 1 \text{ and } \nu(j) = 0$$

and put $w_m = y_m^{\eta} - y_m^{\nu}$. Subtracting the equations (ν) from (η) we get from $x_i^{\eta} - x_i^{\nu} = 0$ that

$$w_{m+1}\, p_m = w_m + (z_m^{\eta} - z_m^{\nu}) \ mod \ \ X$$

and $w_0 = y_0^{\eta} - y_0^{\nu} = 0$ as well. For $m \leq j$ we have $z_m^{\eta} - z_m^{\nu} = 0$ and $z_j^{\eta} - z_j^{\nu} = z_j$, hence $w_m = 0$ for $m < j$ by torsion-freeness and

$$w_j \ \ p_{j-1} = z_j \ \ mod \ \ X$$

which contradicts our choice of z_m's and p_ms.

If nuc $(G/X) = \mathbb{Q}$, then G/X is divisible, hence X is dense and pure in G, we have $X \subseteq_* G \subseteq_* \widehat{X}$, where $\widehat{X}$ is the $\mathbb{Z}$-adic completion of X, and X is a free R-modules of countable rank. Hence $G/X \subseteq_* \widehat{X}/X \cong \bigoplus_{2^{\aleph_0}} \mathbb{Q}$ and there are $2^{\aleph_0}$ independent elements in $\widehat{X}/X$. Using these independent elements, we find systems of equations expressing them as solutions $\mathbb{Z}$-adic limits, which must be solvable by pro-Whitehead. Hence $|G| = |\widehat{X}| = 2^{\aleph_0} > \aleph_1$, which is a contradition.

So we find $p_m \in R$ and $z_m \in G$ such that p_{m-1} does not devide $z_m + X$ in G for all $m \in \omega$. The above argument applies again for $n = 0$ and leads to a contradiction.

Corollary 4.6 *Any splitter of cardinality at most $\aleph_1 < 2^{\aleph_0}$ is free over its nucleus.*

Proof: Let

$$G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$$

be an $\aleph_1$-filtration of the splitter G. By Corollary 4.2 we may assume that each G_α is a pure and free R-submodule of G with $R = \operatorname{nuc} G$. If S denotes the set

$$\{\alpha \in \omega_1 : G_\alpha \text{ is contra-Whitehead in } G\},$$

then S is not stationary in ω_1 by the last Proposition 4.4. We may assume that all G_α are pro-Whitehead in G and each $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ is countable, hence free by Theorem 4.5. We see that G must be free as well. $\square$

5 Splitters Of Type I Under CH

In view of Section 4 we may assume CH to derive a theorem in ZFC showing freeness for $\aleph_1$-free splitters of cardinality $\aleph_1$ of type I. The advantage of the set theoretical assumption is - compared with the proof based on the weak continuum hypothesis WCH in Section 8 - that the proof given here by no means is technical. Recall that G is of type I if $G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$ for some $\aleph_1$-filtration $\{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ of pure submodules G_α such that **each** $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ $(\alpha > 0)$ is a minimal non-free R-module. In this section we want to show the following

Proposition 5.1 (ZFC + CH) *Modules of type I are not splitters.*

Combining Proposition 5.1 and Corollary 4.6 we have can remove CH and have the immediate consequence which holds in ZFC.

Corollary 5.2 *Any $\aleph_1$-free splitter of type I (and cardinality $\aleph_1$) is free over its nucleus.*

The proof of Proposition 5.1 is based on an observation strongly related to type I concerning splitting maps. Then we want to prove a step lemma for applications of CH. Finally we use CH to show $\operatorname{Ext}(G, G) \neq 0$ in Theorem 5.1. In Section 1 we noticed that if

$$0 \longrightarrow B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \xrightarrow{\alpha} A \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence, hence representing an element in $\operatorname{Ext}(A, B)$, then this element is 0 if and only if there is a splitting map $\gamma : A \longrightarrow C$ such that $\gamma\alpha = id_A$. This simple fact is the key for the next two results.

Observation 5.3 *Let* $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1} G_\alpha$ *be a filtration of type I. For* $\alpha \in \omega_1$, *let*

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H_\alpha \longrightarrow G_\alpha \longrightarrow 0 \qquad\qquad (\alpha)$$

be a continuous, increasing chain of short exact sequences with union

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow 0 \qquad\qquad (\omega_1)$$

and let $H^0 \cong G$ *be* $\aleph_1$*-free. Then any splitting map of* (1) *has at most one extension to a splitting map of* (ω_1).

Proof: We may assume that the splitting map $\sigma : G_1 \longrightarrow H_1$ of (1) has two extensions $\sigma, \sigma' : G \longrightarrow H$ which split. Since ω_1 is a limit ordinal, there is some $\beta < \omega_1$ minimal with $(\sigma - \sigma') \restriction G_\beta \neq 0$. Clearly β is not a limit ordinal and $\sigma - \sigma'$ induces a non-trivial map $\delta : G_\beta / G_{\beta-1} \longrightarrow H_\beta$. The domain of this map is minimal non-free, while its range is $\aleph_1$-free, hence δ must be 0, a contradiction. $\square$

Step-Lemma 5.4 *Let* $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1} G_\alpha$ *be a filtration of type I and let*

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H_\alpha \xrightarrow{h} G_\alpha \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence with $H^0 \cong G$. *If* $\sigma : G_\alpha \longrightarrow H_\alpha$ *is a splitting map, then there is an extension of this sequence such that* σ *does not extend to a splitting map* σ' *of the new short exact sequence:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & H^0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H_\alpha \arrow[r, shift left, "h"] \arrow[d] & G_\alpha \arrow[l, shift left, "\sigma"] \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & H^0 \arrow[r] & H' \arrow[r, shift left, "h'"] & G_{\alpha+1} \arrow[l, shift left, "\sigma'", "/" marking] \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Moreover, the vertical maps in the diagram are inclusions and if $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ *is* n*-free-by-1, then* $B'_{\alpha+1}$ *is a free* R*-module of rank* n *and*

$$H' = \langle H_\alpha \oplus B'_{\alpha+1},\ y''_{\alpha m} : m \in \omega \rangle$$

and $B'_{\alpha+1}$ *is mapped under* h' *mod* G_α *onto a free maximal pure* R*-submodule of* $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$.

Proof of the Step-Lemma 5.4: We will use special elements $s_m \in R \quad (m \in \omega)$ to kill extensions. It will help the reader to pose precise conditions on the choice of the s_m's only when needed, which will be at the end of the proof. Readers familiar with such proofs will know that we are working to produce a p-adic catastrophe.

First we use the fact that $G' = G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ is minimal non-free, say n-free-by-1. By (2.3) and (2.4) we have

$$G' = \langle \bigoplus_{i<n} x_i\ R,\ y_m R,\ m \in \omega \rangle$$

with the only relations

$$y_{m+1}p_m = y_m + \sum_{i<n} x_i k_{im} \quad (m \in \omega)$$

and coefficients

$$p_m, k_{im} \in R.$$

By the last equations we can find $g_{\alpha m} \in G_\alpha$ and $x_{\alpha i}, y_{\alpha m} \in G_{\alpha+1}$ such that

$$(*) \begin{cases} G_{\alpha+1} = \langle G_\alpha, x_{\alpha i}R, y_{\alpha m}R : i < n, \quad m \in \omega \rangle \\ \text{with the relations } y_{\alpha m+1}p_m = y_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} x_{\alpha i}k_{im} + g_{\alpha m}\ (m \in \omega). \end{cases}$$

The action of σ is known to us on G_α, hence we can choose a pure element $0 \neq z \in H^0$ and let $z_m = zs_m$, hence H^0/zR is $\aleph_1$-free by purity of z in an $\aleph_1$-free R-module. We also choose preimages $\overline{g}_{\alpha m} = g_{\alpha m}\sigma \in H_\alpha$, hence $\overline{g}_{\alpha m}h = g_{\alpha m}$. We are now in the position to apply Proposition 2.2. Let

$$H' = \langle H_\alpha \oplus B'_{\alpha+1}, y''_{\alpha m} : m \in \omega \rangle \text{ with } B'_{\alpha+1} = \bigoplus_{i<n} x''_{\alpha i}R \subseteq H'$$

be the extension given by the proposition with the useful relations

$$y''_{\alpha m+1}p_m = y''_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} x''_{\alpha i}k_{im} + zs_m + g_{\alpha m}\sigma \qquad (m \in \omega) \tag{5.1}$$

and an extended homomorphism $h' : H' \longrightarrow G_{\alpha+1}$ with

$$h' \restriction H_\alpha = h,\ x''_{\alpha i}h' = x_{\alpha i} \text{ and } y''_{\alpha m}h' = y_{\alpha m}\ (i < n, m \in \omega)$$

such that

$$\ker h' = H^0 \text{ and } \operatorname{Im} h' = G_{\alpha+1}.$$

It remains to show the non-splitting property of the Lemma.

Suppose that $\sigma' : G_{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow H'$ is an extensions of $\sigma : G_\alpha \longrightarrow H$ such that

$$\sigma' h' = id_{G_{\alpha+1}}.$$

Now we want to derive a contradiction when choosing the s_m's accordingly (independent of σ' !) We apply σ' to $(*)$ and get the equations in H':

$$(*\sigma') \qquad y_{\alpha m+1}\sigma' p_m = y_{\alpha m}\sigma' + \sum_{i<n} x_{\alpha i}\sigma' k_{im} + g_{\alpha m}\sigma'.$$

If $d_{\alpha m} = y''_{\alpha m} - y_{\alpha m}\sigma'$, and $e_{\alpha i} = x''_{\alpha i} - x_{\alpha i}\sigma'$ then $d_{\alpha m} \in H^0$ from

$$d_{\alpha m} h' = (y''_{\alpha m} - y_{\alpha m}\sigma')h' = y''_{\alpha m}h' - y_{\alpha m}\sigma' h' = y_{\alpha m} - y_{\alpha m} = 0 \text{ and } \ker h' = H^0.$$

Similarly we argue with $e_{\alpha i}$ and get

$$d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i} \in H^0.$$

Subtracting $(*\sigma')$ from (5.1) leads now to a system of equations in H^0.

$$d_{\alpha m+1} p_m = d_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} e_{\alpha i} k_{im} + z s_m.$$

We consider the submodule

$$W = \langle d_{\alpha m} + zR,\ e_{\alpha i} + zR\ : i < n, m \in \omega \rangle_R \subseteq H^0/zR.$$

The last displayed equations tell us that W is an epimorphic image of a minimal non-free R-module, hence 0 or non-free of finite rank. On the other hand H^0/zR is $\aleph_1$-free as noted above, hence $W = 0$ or equivalently

$$\langle d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i}\ :\ m \in \omega, i < n \rangle_R \subseteq zR \cong R$$

The original equations

$$d_{\alpha m+1} p_m = d_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} e_{\alpha i} k_{im} + s_m \tag{5.2}$$

still hold, but this time require solutions $d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i} \in R$. We get to an end: just choose rational numbers $s_m \in R$ such that (5.2) has no solutions. The existence of these s_m's follows from Lemma 2.1. Finally note that dealing with (5.2) is independent of the particular choices of the extensions of σ as required in the Lemma. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5.1: Let

$$H^0 \cong G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$$

be the module of type I. We must show that $\mathrm{Ext}\,(G, H^0) \neq 0$ and need a non-splitting short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H \xrightarrow{h} G \longrightarrow 0 \tag{5.3}$$

which we construct inductively as an ascending, continuous chain of short exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H_\alpha \xrightarrow{h_\alpha} G_\alpha \longrightarrow 0$$

with union (5.3). Let

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H_1 \xrightarrow{h_1} G_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

be the first step with G_1 a free R-module of countable rank. By Observation 5.3 and CH we can enumerate all possible splitting maps $\sigma : G \longrightarrow H$ of extensions h as in (5.3) of all h_1's by ω_1, and let $\{\sigma_\alpha : G \longrightarrow H,\ \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ be such a list. Using the Step-Lemma 5.4 and the uniqueness in Observation 5.3 we can discard any σ_α at stage α when constructing

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H_{\alpha+1} \xrightarrow{h_{\alpha+1}} G_{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow 0.$$

The resulting extension (5.3) can not split. $\square$

6 Splitters Of Type II

An R-module G is of type II if G has an $\aleph_1$-filtration $G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$ of pure submodules G_α such that G/G_α is $\aleph_1$-free for all non-limit ordinals $\alpha \in \omega_1$, see Section 3. In this section we want to show our second main

Theorem 6.1 *If G is of type II, then G is a splitter if and only if G is free over its nucleus R.*

Remark Theorem 6.1 includes that strongly $\aleph_1$-free R-modules are never splitters, except if trivially the module is free. This was very surprising to us.

Proof: If $S = \{\alpha \in \omega_1 : G/G_\alpha \text{ is not } \aleph_1\text{-free}\}$, then S is a set of limit ordinals by (3.1), and if $\alpha \in S$ we also may assume that $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ is minimal non-free, compare §3.
We get a Γ- invariant $\Gamma(G)$ defined by S modulo the ideal of thin sets, see e.g. [4]. If $\Gamma(G) = 0$, then we find a cub $C \subseteq \omega_1$, with $C \cap S = \emptyset$ and $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in C} G_\alpha$. Let $\alpha_0 = \min C$. Then $G = G_{\alpha_0} \oplus F$ for some free R-module F, and G_{α_0} is a countable submodule of G which must be free over R by Hausen's [12] result, see also [10]. Hence G is free. Note that the hypothesis of G being $\aleph_1$-free is not used in this case! If $\Gamma(G) \neq 0$ we want to show that $\operatorname{Ext}(G, G) \neq 0$. Theorem 6.1 can be rephrased as

$$\text{If } G \text{ is of type II, then G is a splitter if and only if } \Gamma(G) = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Now assume that S is stationary in ω_1. We want to construct some $H \xrightarrow{h} G \longrightarrow 0$ with kernel $\ker h = H^0$, G isomorphic to H^0 by γ, which does not split. If $G_\alpha \gamma = H'_\alpha$ $(\alpha \in \omega_1)$, then

$$H^0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} H'_\alpha$$

is a (canonical) $\aleph_1$-filtration of H^0 copied from G. First we pick elements $z_\alpha \in H^0$ such that $z_\alpha R \cong R$ and $H^0/z_\alpha R$ is $\aleph_1$-free, e.g. take any basis element from a layer $H'_{\alpha+2} \setminus H'_{\alpha+1}$ of the filtration of H^0. Then we define inductively a continuous chain of short exact sequences $(\alpha \in \omega_1)$.

$$(\beta) \begin{cases} 0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H^\beta \xrightarrow{h_\beta} G_\beta \longrightarrow 0 \\ \text{countable, free submodules } H_\beta \subseteq_* H^\beta, \text{ and ordinals } \beta < \beta' \leq \omega_1 \end{cases}$$

subject to various conditions. At the end we want in particular $H = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in \omega_1} H_\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in \omega_1} H^\alpha$.

If $\beta = 0$, then $G_0 = 0$ and we take the zero map $h_0 : H^0 \longrightarrow G_0 \longrightarrow 0$ with kernel H^0.

Suppose (β) is constructed for all $\beta < \alpha$. If α is a limit, we take unions $h_\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{\beta < \alpha} h_\beta$, $H_\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{\beta < \alpha} H_\beta$ and $H^\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{\beta < \alpha} H^\beta$, assuming that at inductive steps sequences extend (naturally) by inclusions. Then visibly (α) holds.

We may assume that (α) is known, and we want to construct $(\alpha + 1)$.
If $\alpha \notin S$, then we extend (α) trivially:

Put $H^{\alpha+1} = H^\alpha \oplus F_\alpha$ with F_α a free R-module of the same rank as the free R-module $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$. As $G_{\alpha+1} = F'_\alpha \oplus G_\alpha$, we may choose an isomorphism $h' : F_\alpha \longrightarrow F'_\alpha$ and extend h_α to $h_{\alpha+1}$ by $h_{\alpha+1} = h_\alpha \oplus h'$. Clearly $\ker h_{\alpha+1} = \ker h_\alpha = H^0$ and $\operatorname{Im} h_{\alpha+1} = G_{\alpha+1}$.

If $\alpha \in S$, then we must work. We have $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha = \langle B'_{\alpha+1}, y'_m : m \in \omega\rangle$ from (2.3) and (2.4). Hence

$$G_{\alpha+1} = \langle G_\alpha, B_{\alpha+1}, y_{\alpha m}R : m \in \omega\rangle,\ B_{\alpha+1} = \bigoplus_{i<n} x_{\alpha i}R \tag{6.2}$$

with relations

$$y_{\alpha m+1}p_m = y_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} x_{\alpha i}k_{im} + g_{\alpha m} \qquad (m \in \omega), \tag{6.3}$$

where $g_{\alpha m} \in G_\alpha$. Let $\bar{B}_{\alpha+1} = \bigoplus\limits_{i<n} \bar{x}_{\alpha i}R$ be a copy of $B_{\alpha+1}$. Then we pose the following additional conditions on $(\alpha+1)$.

(a) $H^{\alpha+1}h_{\alpha+1} = H_{\alpha+1}h_{\alpha+1} = G_{\alpha+1}$

(b) $\bar{B}_{\alpha+1} \subseteq H_{\alpha+1}$

(c) $H^{\alpha+1}/H^\alpha \cong G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$

(d) $H^{\alpha+1}/H_\beta + H'_\gamma$ is free for all $\beta \leq \alpha,\ \beta \notin S$ and $\gamma \in \omega_1$

(e) $H^{\alpha+1}/H_\beta + H'_\gamma$ is $\aleph_1$-free for all $\beta \leq \alpha, \gamma \in \omega_1$

(f) $H'_{\alpha+1} \subseteq H_{\alpha+1} \cap H^0 = H'_{(\alpha+1)'}$.

We choose preimages $\bar{g}_{\alpha m} \in H_\alpha$ such that $\bar{g}_{\alpha m}h_\alpha = g_{\alpha m}$ and apply Proposition 2.2 to define the extension

$$H^\alpha \subseteq H^{\alpha+1} = \langle H^\alpha \oplus \bar{B}_{\alpha+1},\ \bar{y}_{\alpha m}R : m \in \omega\rangle$$

with the relations

$$\bar{y}_{\alpha m+1}p_m = \bar{y}_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} \bar{x}_{\alpha i}k_{im} + z_{\alpha m}s_{\alpha m} + \bar{g}_{\alpha m} \tag{6.4}$$

where

$$\bar{B}_{\alpha+1} \cong \bigoplus_{i<n} x'_i\ R$$

as required in (b). Similarly, by Proposition 2.2 the map h_α extends to an epimorphism $h_{\alpha+1} : H^{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow G_{\alpha+1}$. It is now easy to check that (c) holds and it is also easy to see that $\ker h_{\alpha+1} = H^0$. Next we extend $H_\alpha \subset H_{\alpha+1}$ carefully such that $(\alpha+1)$, (a), (b), (d), (e) and (f) hold.

$\operatorname{Im} h_{\alpha+1} = G_{\alpha+1}$ is a countable module of the $\aleph_1$- free R-module G, hence free and $h_{\alpha+1}$ must split. There is a splitting map

$$\sigma : G_{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow H^{\alpha+1} \text{ such that } \sigma h_{\alpha+1} = id_{G_{\alpha+1}},$$

hence $H^{\alpha+1} = H^0 \oplus G_{\alpha+1}\sigma$. Let

$$\pi_0 : H^{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow H^0,\ \pi_1 : H^{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow G_{\alpha+1}\sigma$$

be the canonical projections with $\pi_0 + \pi_1 = id_{H^{\alpha+1}}$. Recall that $\bar{B}_{\alpha+1} \subseteq H^{\alpha+1}$. Choose $\beta \in \omega_1$ large enough such that $\beta \notin S,\ \beta \geq \alpha', \alpha+1$ and $(\bar{B}_{\alpha+1} + H_\alpha)\pi_0 \subseteq H'_\beta$. This is easy because $\omega_1 \setminus S$ is unbounded and $(\bar{B}_{\alpha+1} + H_\alpha)\pi_0$ is countable. Put $H_{\alpha+1} = H'_\beta \oplus (G_{\alpha+1}\sigma)$ and $\beta = (\alpha+1)'$. Note that

$$G_{\alpha+1} = H^{\alpha+1}h_{\alpha+1} \supseteq H_{\alpha+1}h_{\alpha+1} \supseteq G_{\alpha+1}\sigma h_{\alpha+1} = G_{\alpha+1}$$

and (a) follows.

If $\gamma \leq (\alpha+1)'$, then $H_{\alpha+1} + H_\gamma = H_{\alpha+1}$ and if $\gamma \geq (\alpha+1)'$, then $H_{\alpha+1} + H'_\gamma = H'_\gamma \oplus G_{\alpha+1}\sigma$ and (d) follows. We see immediately $H_\alpha\pi_1 \subseteq G_{\alpha+1}\sigma$ and $H_\alpha\pi_0 \subseteq H'_{(\alpha+1)'}$, hence

$$H_\alpha \subseteq H_\alpha\pi_0 + H_\alpha\pi_1 \subseteq H_{\alpha+1}$$

and $(\alpha+1)$ holds; similarly $\bar{B}_{\alpha+1} \subseteq H_{\alpha+1}$ for (c). From $H'_{(\alpha+1)'} \subseteq H^0$ and the modular law we have $H_{\alpha+1} \cap H^0 = H'_{(\alpha+1)'} \oplus (G_{\alpha+1}\sigma \cap H^0) = H'_{(\alpha+1)'}$ and (f) holds.

Finally we choose $H = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1} H^\alpha, h = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1} h_\alpha$ and

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H \xrightarrow{h} G \longrightarrow 0 \tag{6.5}$$

is established and it remains to show that (6.5) does not split. Suppose for contradiction that $\sigma : G \longrightarrow H$ is a splitting map for h. We have $H = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1} H_\alpha$ and $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1} G_\alpha$ $\aleph_1$-filtration. Using the above properties of the H_α's, it follows by a back and forth argument that

$$E = \{\alpha \in \omega_1 : H_\alpha \cap H^0 = H'_\alpha,\ G_\alpha\sigma \subseteq H_\alpha\}$$

is a cub. On the other hand S is stationary in ω_1 and we find

$$\alpha \in S \cap E.$$

From (6.3) and (6.4) we have

$$y_{\alpha m+1}\sigma p_m = y_{\alpha m}\sigma + \sum_{i<n} x_{\alpha i}\sigma k_{im} + g_{\alpha m}\sigma$$

and

$$\bar{y}_{\alpha m+1} p_m = \bar{y}_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} \bar{x}_{\alpha i} k_{im} + z_\alpha s_{\alpha m} + \bar{g}_{\alpha m} \text{ with } g_{\alpha m}\sigma,\ \bar{g}_{\alpha m} \in H_\alpha \text{ and } G_\alpha \sigma \subseteq H_\alpha.$$

Put $d_{\alpha m} = \bar{y}_{\alpha m} - y_{\alpha m}\sigma$, $f_{\alpha m} = \bar{g}_{\alpha m} - g_{\alpha m}\sigma$, $e_{\alpha i} = \bar{x}_{\alpha i} - x_{\alpha i}\sigma$ and notice that $d_{\alpha m}h = e_{\alpha i}h = f_{\alpha m}h = 0$, hence $d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i}, f_{\alpha m} \in H^0$.

Subtracting the last displayed equations we get

(j) $d_{\alpha m+1} p_m = d_{\alpha m} + \sum\limits_{i<n} e_{\alpha i} k_{im} + f_{\alpha m} + z_\alpha s_{\alpha m}$ in H^0.

Recall that $f_{\alpha m} \in H_\alpha \cap H^0 \subseteq H'_{\alpha'}$ by (f) and *mod* $T = H'_{\alpha'} + z_\alpha R$ the equations (j) say that $W = \langle d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i} : i < n, m \in \omega \rangle + T/T$ is either minimal non-free or 0. On the other hand H^0/T is $\aleph_1$-free, hence $W = 0$ and $\langle d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i}, z_\alpha \rangle \subseteq H'_\alpha + z_\alpha R$. Recall from (e) that H^0/H'_α is $\aleph_1$-free. Hence (j) turns into

$$d_{\alpha m+1} p_m \equiv d_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} e_{\alpha i} k_{im} + z_\alpha s_{\alpha m} \mod H'_\alpha.$$

Using $\aleph_1$-freeness of $H^0/z_\alpha R$ these equations tell us that we must have solutions $d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i} \in R$ for

(k) $d_{\alpha m+1} p_m = d_{\alpha m} + \sum\limits_{i<n} e_{\alpha i} k_{im} + s_{\alpha m}$.

In Lemma 2.1 we selected particular $s_{\alpha m}$'s in R such that (k) has no solution in R. Now we are ready to make this choice which we should have done right at the beginning of the proof and hence derive a contradiction; we conclude $\operatorname{Ext}(G, G) \neq 0$. $\square$

From Theorem 6.1 we see that non-free but strongly $\aleph_1$-free abelian groups are never splitters. We find this very surprising. Particular groups like the Griffith-group $\mathbb{G}$ below which is a Whitehead group ($\operatorname{Ext}(\mathbb{G},\mathbb{Z})=0$) under Martin's axiom and $\neg CH$ is not a splitter. Recall a nice and easy construction of $\mathbb{G}$ which is sometimes Whitehead but always fails to be a splitter in general.

Let $P=\mathbb{Z}^{\aleph_1}=\prod\limits_{\alpha\in\aleph_1}\alpha\mathbb{Z}$ the cartesian product of $\mathbb{Z}$. If $\lambda\in\aleph_1$ is a limit ordinal choose an order preserving map $\delta_\lambda:\omega\longrightarrow\lambda$ with $\sup(\omega\delta_\lambda)=\lambda$. Then, along this ladder system we define branch-elements

$$c_{\lambda n}=\sum_{i\geq n}(i\delta_\lambda)\frac{i!}{n!}$$

which are a 'divisibility chain' of c_{λ_0} modulo $\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\aleph_1}\alpha\mathbb{Z}$, hence

$$\mathbb{G}=\langle\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\aleph_1}\alpha\mathbb{Z},c_{\lambda n}:\lambda\in\aleph_1,\ \lambda\text{ a limit ordinal, }n\in\omega\rangle$$

is a pure subgroup of P. We see that $|\mathbb{G}|=\aleph_1$ and $\mathbb{G}$ is $\aleph_1$- free by $\aleph_1$-freeness of P; see [5] (Vol 1, p 94, Theorem 19.2). Moreover $\Gamma_G\neq 0$ because $G_\beta=\mathbb{G}\cap\prod\limits_{\alpha<\beta}\alpha\mathbb{Z}$ $(\beta\in\omega_1)$ is an $\aleph_1$-filtration of $\mathbb{G}$ with $G_{\lambda+1}/G_\lambda$ divisible for all limit ordinals λ. Hence $\mathbb{G}$ is not free. It is easy to check that $\mathbb{G}$ is $\aleph_1$-separable, hence strongly $\aleph_1$-free; see also [4], p. 183, Theorem 1.3.

7 Splitters Of Type III

If G is of type III then we recall from Section 3 that $G=\bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1}G_\alpha,\ G_0=0$ with (3.4) – (3.6) and $G_1=\bigcup\limits_{j\in\omega_1}G_{0j}$ and $\{G_{0j}:j\in\omega_1\}$ is an $\aleph_1$-filtration of pure submodules G_{0j} such that each G_{0j+1}/G_{0j} is minimal non-free. Here we will show:

Theorem 7.1 *Modules of type III are not splitters.*

Proof: Let $G'=\bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\omega_1}G'_\alpha$ be an isomorphic copy of G taking G_α to G'_α, and choose a sequence of elements $z_\alpha\in G'_{\alpha+2}$ $(\alpha\in\omega_1)$ such that

$$G'_{\alpha+1}\cap z_\alpha R=0\text{ and }G'_{\alpha+2}/G'_{\alpha+1}\oplus z_\alpha R\text{ is }\aleph_1\text{-free.}$$

This is possible by (III).

By a basic observation from Section 1 it is enough to show that $\operatorname{Ext}(G_1, G) \neq 0$. Inductively we will construct a non-trivial element in $\operatorname{Ext}(G_1, G)$. We consider the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(0) & 0 \arrow[r] & G' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & H^0 \arrow[r, "h_0"] \arrow[d] & G_{00} = 0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
(\beta) & 0 \arrow[r] & G' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & H^\beta \arrow[r, "h_\beta"] \arrow[d] & G_{0\beta} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
(\omega_1) & 0 \arrow[r] & G' \arrow[r] & H \arrow[r, "h"] & G_1 \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

The first row is the trivial extension with $G' = H^0$ and $h_0 = 0$. Vertical maps and maps between G' and H's are inclusions. The sequences (β) are increasing continuous and suppose (β) is constructed for all $\beta < \alpha$. Then $h_\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} h_\beta$ and

$$0 \longrightarrow G' \longrightarrow \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} H^\beta \xrightarrow{h_\alpha} G_{0\alpha} \longrightarrow 0$$

if α is a limit. Next we want to construct $(\alpha+1)$ from (α) and recall that $G' = G_{0\alpha+1}/G_{0\alpha}$ is minimal non-free generated as in (2.3), (2.4). We can write

$$G_{0\alpha+1} = \langle G_{0\alpha},\ B_{\alpha+1}, y_{\alpha m}R : m \in \omega\rangle, \quad B_{\alpha+1} = \bigoplus_{i<n} x_{\alpha i}R \tag{7.1}$$

with relations

$$y_{\alpha m+1}p_m = y_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} x_{\alpha i}k_{im} + g_{\alpha m}\ (m \in \omega),\ g_{\alpha m} \in G_{0\alpha}. \tag{7.2}$$

Then we define

$$h_{\alpha+1} : H^{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow G_{0\alpha+1} \longrightarrow 0.$$

by Proposition 2.2. Hence

$$H^{\alpha+1} = \langle H^\alpha \oplus \bar{B}_{\alpha+1},\ \bar{y}_{\alpha m}R : m \in \omega\rangle$$

has the relations

$$\bar{y}_{\alpha m+1}p_m = \bar{y}_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} \bar{x}_{\alpha i}k_{im} + z_\alpha s_{\alpha m} + \bar{g}_{\alpha n}\ \ (m \in \omega), \tag{7.3}$$

where the $s_{\alpha m} \in R$ will be specified later on, and $\bar{g}_{\alpha m} \in H^{\alpha}$.

Suppose that (ω_1) splits and consequently $\sigma : G_1 \longrightarrow H$ is a splitting map for h. Then let

$$d_{\beta m} = y_{\beta m} - \bar{y}_{\beta m},\ e_{\beta i} = x_{\beta i}\sigma - \bar{x}_{\beta i} \text{ and } f_{\beta m} = g_{\beta m}\sigma - \bar{g}_{\beta m}.$$

From splitting we get again

$$d_{\beta m},\ e_{\beta i},\ f_{\beta m} \in G' \quad (\beta \in \omega_1, m \in \omega, i < n).$$

Using $G' = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G'_{\alpha}$ for $\beta \in \omega_1$ we find $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that

$$d_{\beta m},\ e_{\beta i},\ f_{\beta m} \in G'_{\alpha} \text{ for all } i < n, m \in \omega.$$

Consider a map $\tau : \omega_1 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ taking any $\alpha \in \omega_1$ to

$$\tau(\alpha) = \ \min\{\beta \in \omega_1; \beta \text{ a limit ordinal}, d_{\alpha m},\ e_{\alpha i},\ f_{\alpha m} \in G'_{\beta}, \alpha \leq \beta, m \in \omega, i < n\}$$

and note that $C = \{\alpha \in \omega_1 : \tau(\alpha) = \alpha\}$ is a cub in ω_1 and a subset of

$$E = \{\alpha \in \omega : \alpha \text{ a limit ordinal}, d_{\beta m},\ e_{\beta i},\ f_{\beta m} \in G'_{\alpha} \text{ for all } \beta < \alpha, i < n, m \in \omega\}.$$

Hence E is a cub in ω_1. Next we apply σ to (7.2) and subtract (7.3). Hence we get a system of equations in $H^{\alpha+1}$.

$$d_{\alpha m+1}p_m = d_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} e_{\alpha i}k_{im} + f_{\alpha m} + z_{\alpha}s_{\alpha m} \ \ (m \in \omega) \tag{7.4}$$

If $\alpha \in E$, then *modulo* H^{α} the equations (7.4) turn into

$$d_{\alpha m+1}p_m \equiv d_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} e_{\alpha i}k_{im} + z_{\alpha}s_{\alpha m} \ \ (m \in \omega)$$

and modulo $z_{\alpha}R$ an earlier argument and $\aleph_1$-freeness of $G'/G_{\alpha} \oplus z_{\alpha}R$ show that the last equation requires solutions $d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i} \in R$ for

$$d_{\alpha m+1}p_m = d_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} e_{\alpha i}k_{im} + s_{\alpha m} \ \ (m \in \omega)$$

By a special choice of $s_{\alpha m}$'s in Lemma 2.1 this is now excluded, a contradiction. Hence (ω_1) has no splitting map and Theorem 7.1 follows. □

8 Appendix: Splitters Of Type I Under $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$

In Section 5 we have seen a proof that CH implies modules of type I are never splitters. A slight variation but some what technical modification of the proof, shows that this result can be extended to WCH that is $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$. Due to Section 5 this is not needed for the main result of this paper dealing with modules of cardinality $\aleph_1$ but it will be interesting when passing to cardinals $> \aleph_1$. We outline the main steps, their proofs are suggested by the proofs in Section 5.

Theorem 8.1 (ZFC + $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$) *Modules of type I are not splitters.*

Step-Lemma 8.2 *Let* $G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$ *be a filtration of type I and let*

$$0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow H_\alpha \xrightarrow{h} G_\alpha \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence with some $z \in K$ *such that* $zR \cong R$ *and* $K, K/zR$ *are* $\aleph_1$*-free. Then there are two commuting diagrams* $(\epsilon = 0, 1)$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & K \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H_\alpha \arrow[r, "h"] \arrow[d] & G_\alpha \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & K_\epsilon \arrow[r] & H_\epsilon \arrow[r, "h_\epsilon"] & G_{\alpha+1} \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

with vertical maps inclusions such that any third row with H'_ϵ $\aleph_1$*-free,*

$$0 \longrightarrow K'_\epsilon \longrightarrow H'_\epsilon \xrightarrow{h'_\epsilon} G_\beta \longrightarrow 0$$

and any splitting map σ *of* h *cannot have two splitting extensions* σ_ϵ *of* h'_ϵ :

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & K \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H_\alpha \arrow[r, shift left, "h"] \arrow[d] & G_\alpha \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[l, shift left, "\sigma"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & K_\epsilon \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H_\epsilon \arrow[r, "h_\epsilon"] \arrow[d] & G_{\alpha+1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & K'_\epsilon \arrow[r] & H'_\epsilon \arrow[r, shift left, "h'_\epsilon"] & G_\beta \arrow[r] \arrow[l, shift left, "\sigma_\epsilon", "/" marking] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Moreover $H_\epsilon = \langle H_\alpha \bigoplus \overline{B}^\epsilon_{\alpha+1},\ y^\epsilon_{\alpha m} : m \in \omega\rangle$ *and* $\overline{B}^\epsilon_{\alpha+1}$ *is mapped under* h_ϵ mod G_α *onto a free maximal* R*-submodule of* $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ *cf. (2.3).*

Definition 8.3 *If such an extension σ_ϵ as in (8.2) exists for some $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}$ we say that σ* **splits over** (H_ϵ, h_ϵ).

Proof of Lemma 8.2: Compare the proof of the Step-Lemma 5.4 but note that at the end you must take once more differences of the elements $d_{\alpha m}, e_{\alpha i}$ for $\epsilon = 1$ and $\epsilon = 0$ respectively. Then we are able to apply Lemma 2.1 to get a contradiction from splitting. $\square$

We then apply the Step-Lemma and weak diamond Φ_{ω_1} to construct a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H \xrightarrow{h} G \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let $\gamma : G \longrightarrow H^0$ be a fixed isomorphism. Later we will use consequences of Φ_{ω_1} to show that h does not split.

Proof of Theorem 8.1: If $H'_\alpha = G_\alpha \gamma$, then $H^0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} H'_\alpha$ is an $\aleph_1$-filtration if $G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} G_\alpha$ is the given filtration of type I.

Let $T = {}^{\omega_1 >}2$ be the tree of all branches $\eta : \alpha \longrightarrow 2$ for some $\alpha \in \omega_1$. We call $\alpha = l(\eta)$ the length of η. Branches are ordered as usually, hence $\eta < \eta'$ if $\eta' \restriction \mathrm{Dom}\ \eta = \eta$. The empty set $\emptyset$ is the bottom element of the tree. If $\eta \in T$, then we construct triples

$$(H_\eta, H^\eta, h_\eta)$$

of R-modules $H_\eta \subseteq H^\eta$ with H_η free of countable rank and a homomorphism

$$h_\eta : H^\eta \longrightarrow G$$

subject to various natural conditions.

(i) $\begin{cases} H^\emptyset = H^0, H_\emptyset = 0 \text{ and } h_\emptyset = 0, \text{ hence} \\ 0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H_\emptyset \xrightarrow{h_\emptyset} G_0 = 0 \longrightarrow 0 \text{ is short exact.} \end{cases}$

(ii) $\begin{cases} \text{If } \eta < \eta', \text{ then } (H_\eta, H^\eta, h_\eta) \subseteq (H_{\eta'}, H^{\eta'}, h_{\eta'}), \text{ i.e.} \\ H_\eta \subseteq H_{\eta'}, H^\eta \subseteq H^{\eta'} \text{ and } h_\eta \subseteq h_{\eta'}. \end{cases}$

(iii) $H^0 = \ker h_\eta$ and $\mathrm{Im}\, h_\eta = G_{l(\eta)} = H_\eta h_\eta$.

$$\text{(iv)}\quad \begin{cases} \text{If } \alpha \in \omega_1 \text{ is a limit and } \eta \in {}^{\alpha}2, \text{ then we take unions} \\ (H_\eta, H^\eta, h_\eta) = \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} (H_{\eta\restriction\beta}, H^{\eta\restriction\beta}, h_{\eta\restriction\beta}) = (\bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} H_{\eta\restriction\beta}, \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} H^{\eta\restriction\beta}, \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} h_{\eta\restriction\beta}). \end{cases}$$

If $l(\eta) = \alpha$ we put further restrictions on those triples. In this case $G' = G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ is minimal non-free, and G' can be represented by (2.3), (2.4). There are elements $g_{\alpha m} \in G_\alpha, x_{\alpha i}, y_{\alpha m} \in G_{\alpha+1}$ with

$$G_{\alpha+1} = \langle G_\alpha, B_{\alpha+1}, y_{\alpha m} R \ : \ m \in \omega\rangle, \ \ B_{\alpha+1} = \bigoplus_{i<n} x_{\alpha i}\, R$$

and relations

$$y_{\alpha m+1} p_m = y_{\alpha m} + \sum_{i<n} x_{\alpha i} k_{im} + g_{\alpha m}.$$

We choose an isomorphic copy $\overline{B}_{\alpha+1} = \bigoplus\limits_{i<n} \overline{x}_\alpha R$ of $B_{\alpha+1}$ and now continue defining the tree with triples.

If $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}$, then we require more from $(H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}, H^{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}, h_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>})$.

(S i) $\quad H_\eta \oplus \overline{B}_{\alpha+1} \subseteq H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$

(S ii) $\quad H_{\eta'} + H'_\beta \subseteq_* H^{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$ for all $\eta' \in {}^{\alpha\geq}2$, and $\beta \in \omega_1$.

(S iii) $\quad H'_\alpha \subseteq H_\eta \cap H^0 \subseteq H_{\alpha'}$ for some $\alpha' \in [\alpha, \omega_1)$

Note that $H_\eta \cap H^0 = \ker(h_\eta \restriction H_\eta)$.

(S iv) The crucial condition:

Suppose $\sigma : G_\alpha \longrightarrow H_\eta$ is a homomorphism extending to $\sigma_\epsilon : G_{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow H^{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$, then not both of them can be splitting maps over $(H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}, h_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>})$ for $\epsilon = 0, 1$.

Before we begin with the inductive construction, we observe from (iii) that $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha \cong H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}/H_\eta \cong H^{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}/H^\eta$ for $\operatorname{Dom}\eta = \alpha$.

If $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ and $H = H(\eta) = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\omega_1} H^{\eta\restriction\alpha}$, then $H' = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\omega_1} H_{\eta\restriction\alpha} \subseteq H$ from (ii). (S iii) ensures $H^0 \subseteq H'$ and from (iii) we get $H/H_0 = H'/H_0$, hence $H' = H$. This will show that

$$(\eta 1) \qquad H(\eta) = \bigcup_{\alpha<\omega_1} H_{\eta\restriction\alpha} = \bigcup_{\alpha<\omega_1} H^{\eta\restriction\alpha} \qquad (\eta \in {}^{\omega_1}2)$$

Similarly $h(\eta) = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\omega_1} h_{\eta\restriction\alpha}$ is a well-defined homomorphism $h(\eta) : H(\eta) \longrightarrow G$ by (ii), it is onto with kernel H^0 by (iii), hence

$$(\eta 2) \qquad 0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H(\eta) \xrightarrow{h(\eta)} G \longrightarrow 0 \qquad (\eta \in {}^{\omega_1}2).$$

Condition $(\eta 1)$ provides an $\aleph_1$- filtration used to apply weak diamond Φ for showing that $(\eta 2)$ does not split for some η.

Next we will show that the tree with triples exists. This will follow by induction along the length α branches $\eta \in {}^{\alpha}2$. The case $\alpha = 0$ is (i) and already established. Suppose the construction is completed for all $\beta < \alpha$ and $\alpha < \omega_1$ is a limit ordinal. For $\eta \in {}^{\alpha}2$ we define (H_η, H^η, h_η) as in (iv) and it is easy to verify that all conditions hold, notably (S iii), because we take only countable unions. We come to the inductive step constructing $(H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}, H^{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}, h_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>})$ from (H_η, H^η, h_η) for $\alpha = \operatorname{Dom}\eta$.

First we adopt the Step-Lemma for $K = H^\eta \cap H^0 = \ker h_\eta, H_\alpha = H^\eta, H_\epsilon = H^{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}, h = h_\eta, h_\epsilon = h_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$ and note that the needed element z exists because $H^\eta \cap H^0 \subseteq H'_\alpha$ is free. We must still define $H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>} \supseteq H_\eta$ carefully satisfying (ii), (S i) - (S iii) and the last equality in (iii): Write again h_ϵ for $h_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$ and H^ϵ for $H^{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$. We know that $\operatorname{Im} h_\epsilon = G_{\alpha+1}$ is a countable submodule of the $\aleph_1$-free module G, hence free and h_ϵ must split. There is a splitting map $\varphi_\epsilon : G_{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow H^\epsilon$ such that $\varphi_\epsilon h_\epsilon = id_{G\alpha+1}$, hence

$$H^\epsilon = H^0 \oplus (G_{\alpha+1}\varphi_\epsilon)$$

from the first part of (iii). Let $\pi_0^\epsilon : H^\epsilon \longrightarrow H^0$ and $\pi_1^\epsilon : H^\epsilon \longrightarrow H^0$ be the canonical projections, hence $\pi_0^\epsilon + \pi_1^\epsilon = id_{H^\epsilon}$.

Choose $\beta = (\alpha+1)' < \omega_1$ large enough such that $\overline{B}_{\alpha+1}\pi_0 \cup H_\eta\pi_0 \subseteq H'_\beta$, where $\overline{B}_{\alpha+1}$ is taken from the Step-Lemma. We can choose β because $\overline{B}_{\alpha+1}$ and H_η are countable. Put

$$H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>} = H'_\beta \oplus (G_{\alpha+1}\varphi_\epsilon),$$

hence by the known half of (iii)

$$G_{\alpha+1} = H^\epsilon h_\epsilon \supseteq H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>} h_\epsilon \supseteq G_{\alpha+1}\varphi_\epsilon h_\epsilon = G_{\alpha+1}$$

and the other half of (iii) follows.
If $\gamma \leq \beta$, then $H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>} + H'_\gamma = H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$ and if $\gamma \geq \beta$, then $H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>} + H'_\gamma = H'_\gamma \oplus (G_{\alpha+1}\varphi_\epsilon)$ with quotient $H^{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}/H'_\gamma \oplus (G_{\alpha+1}\varphi_\epsilon) \cong H^0/H'_\gamma$ which shows (S ii). Trivially $H_\eta\pi_1 \subseteq (G_{\alpha+1}\varphi_\epsilon)$ and $H_\eta\pi_0 \subseteq H'_\beta$ by the choice of β, hence

$$H_\eta = H_\eta id_{H^\epsilon} \subseteq H_\eta\pi_0 + H_\eta\pi_1 \subseteq H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$$

and (ii) holds. Similarly $\overline{B}_{\alpha+1} \subseteq H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>}$ and (S i) is shown. From $H'_\beta \subseteq H^0$ and the modular law we have

$$H_{\eta\hat{}<\epsilon>} \cap H^0 = H'_\beta \oplus (G_{\alpha+1}\varphi_\epsilon \cap H^0) = H'_\beta$$

and (S iii) holds.

The construction of the tree with triples is complete. We are ready to use the weak diamond $\Phi_{\aleph_1}(S)$ to show that G is not a splitter.

We will use $\Phi_{\omega_1}(S)$ as stated in Eklof, Mekler [4, p. 143, Lemma 1.7] and note that $G = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\omega_1} G_\alpha, H(\eta) = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\omega_1} H_{\eta\restriction\alpha}$ are $\aleph_1$-filtrations. $\Phi_{\omega_1}(S)$ must tell us which $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ we should pick. We define a partition P so that for $\alpha \in S$ a homomorphism $\sigma : G_\alpha \longrightarrow H_\eta$ ($\eta \in {}^\alpha 2$) has value $P_\alpha(\sigma) = 0$ if and only if σ does **not** split over $(H_{\eta\hat{}0}, h_{\eta\hat{}0})$. By the Step-Lemma build into the construction, we observe that

(a) if $P(\sigma) = 1$, then σ cannot split over $(H_{\eta\hat{}1}, h_{\eta\hat{}1})$

The prediction principle finds us a branch $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ with the Φ-property

$$(b) \begin{cases} \text{If } \sigma : G \longrightarrow H \text{ is any map, then} \\ S' = \{\alpha \in S : P_\alpha(\sigma \restriction G_\alpha) = \eta(\alpha)\} \text{ is stationary in } \omega_1. \end{cases}$$

We pick that branch and build $H = H(\eta)$ and $h = h(\eta)$ accordingly, hence $0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H \xrightarrow{h} G \longrightarrow 0$ is short exact. After the branch is fixed we let $H^{\eta\restriction\alpha} = H^\alpha, h \restriction H^\alpha = h_\alpha$ and $H_{\eta\restriction\alpha} = H_\alpha$. Now we claim that the last sequence does not split. Suppose to the contrary that $\sigma : G \longrightarrow H$ is a splitting map, hence $\sigma h = id_G$. Notice that the set

$$C = \{\alpha < \omega_1 \text{ }, H_\alpha \cap H^0 = H'_\alpha, G_\alpha\sigma \subseteq H_\alpha\}$$

is a cub. Since $S' \subseteq \omega_1$ is stationary, we find an $\alpha \in S' \cap C$ and also let $\sigma \restriction G_\alpha = \sigma$, hence

$$(c) \begin{cases} \sigma : G_\alpha \longrightarrow H_\alpha \subset H^\alpha, \ P_\alpha(\sigma) = \eta\ (\alpha) \text{ and} \\ \sigma \text{ is a splitting map of } h_\alpha : H^\alpha \longrightarrow G_\alpha. \end{cases}$$

We also find some $\alpha < \beta \in C$. The difficulty is that $G_{\alpha+1}\sigma \subseteq H_{\alpha+1}$ does not follow, as in the case S is not costationary. Hence we need the stronger Step-Lemma (as usual).

If $\eta(\alpha) = P(\sigma) = 0$, then $(H_{\eta\hat{}0}, h_{\eta\hat{}0})$ is part of the construction of

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0 \longrightarrow H_{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow G_{\alpha+1} \longrightarrow 0$$

and σ does not split over $(H_{\eta\hat{}0}, h_{\eta\hat{}0})$, but σ is a global splitting map, hence σ splits at β over $(H_{\eta\hat{}0}, h_{\eta\hat{}0})$, a contradiction.
Necessarily $\eta(\alpha) = P(\sigma) = 1$ and by (a) σ does not split over $(H_{\eta\hat{}1}, h_{\eta\hat{}1})$, but this time $(H_{\eta\hat{}1}, h_{\eta\hat{}1})$ was used in the construction of $H \xrightarrow{h} G$ and a contradiction follows. This shows that σ is no splitting map, and G is not a splitter. $\square$

References

[1] **T. Becker, L. Fuchs, S. Shelah**, Whitehead modules over domains, Forum Mathematicum **1** (1989), 53–68.

[2] **A.L.S. Corner, R. Göbel**, Prescribing endomorphism algebras - A unified treatment, Proceed. London Math. Soc. (3) **50** (1985), 471 – 483.

[3] **P. Eklof** Set Theoretic Methods in Homological Algebra and Abelian Groups, Les Presses de l' Universitè de Montréal 1980.

[4] **P. Eklof, A. Mekler** Almost free modules, Set-theoretic methods, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1990.

[5] **L. Fuchs**, Infinite abelian groups - Volume 1, 2 Academic Press, New York (1970, 1973).

[6] **P. A. Griffith**, A solution of the splitting mixed problem of Baer, Trans. American Math. Soc. **139** (1969), 261–269.

[7] **R. Göbel, R. Prelle**, Solution of two problems on cotorsion abelian groups, Archiv der Math. **31** (1978), 423–431.

[8] **R. Göbel**, Cotorsion-free abelian groups with only small cotorsion images, Austral. Math. Soc. (Ser. A) **50** (1991), 243–247.

[9] **R. Göbel**, New aspects for two classical theorems on torsion splitting, Comm. Algebra **15** (1987), 2473–2495.

[10] **R. Göbel, S. Shelah**, Cotorsion theories and splitters, to appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (1999)

[11] **R. Göbel, J. Trlifaj**, Cotilting and a hierarchy of almost cotorsion groups, to appear in Journal of Algebra (1999)

[12] **J. Hausen**, Automorphismen gesättigte Klassen abzählbaren abelscher Gruppen, Studies on Abelian Groups, Springer, Berlin (1968), 147–181.

[13] **C. M. Ringel**, The braid group action on the set of exceptional sequences of a hereditary artin algebra, pp. 339 – 352 in *Abelian group theory and related topics*, Contemporary Math. **171** American Math. Soc., Providence, R.I. 1994.

[14] **C. M. Ringel**, Bricks in hereditary length categories, Resultate der Mathematik **6** (1983), 64 – 70.

[15] **L. Salce**, Cotorsion theories for abelian groups, Symposia Math. **23** (1979), 11–32.

[16] **P. Schultz**, Self-splitting groups, Preprint series of the University of Western Australia at Perth (1980)

[17] **S. Shelah** Infinite abelian groups, Whitehead problem and some constructions, Israel Journal Math. **18** (1974), 243 – 256.

[18] **S. Shelah** On uncountable abelian groups, Israel Journal Math. **32** (1979), 311 –330.

[19] **S. Shelah**, A combinatorial theorem and endomorphism rings of abelian groups II, pp. 37 – 86, in *Abelian groups and modules*, CISM Courses and Lectures, **287**, Springer, Wien 1984.

Rüdiger Göbel
Fachbereich 6, Mathematik und Informatik
Universität Essen, 45117 Essen, Germany
e–mail: R.Goebel@Uni-Essen.De
and
Saharon Shelah
Department of Mathematics
Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel
and Rutgers University, Newbrunswick, NJ, U.S.A
e-mail: Shelah@math.huji.ae.il